



IFW  
3624

Petitioner's Docket No. U 012900--8

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: Ingrid Maria PERSCKY de FABREGA  
Application No.: 09/754,021 Group No.:  
Filed: January 3, 2001 Examiner:  
For: E-COMMERCE DEVELOPMENT INTRANET PORTAL

**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P. O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**STATUS INQUIRY**

1. More than 50 months have passed since

- ☒ **NEW APPLICATIONS**  
the filing of this application on January 3, 2001  
No communication has been received from the Patent and Trademark Office indicating action on this application.
- ☐ **AMENDED APPLICATIONS**  
the filing of a response on \_\_\_\_\_.  
No further communication has been received from the Patent and Trademark Office.
- ☐ **APPEALED APPLICATION**

The Appeal Brief was filed on \_\_\_\_\_

**CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a) and 1.10\***

*(When using Express Mail, the Express Mail label number is **mandatory**;  
Express Mail certification is optional.)*

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

**MAILING**

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

**37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)**

- ☒ with sufficient postage as first class mail.

**37 C.F.R. 1.10\***

- ☐ as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"  
Mailing Label No. \_\_\_\_\_ (mandatory)

**TRANSMISSION**

- ☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office. to **(703) 872-9306**

Date: March 15, 2005

Signature

William R. Evans

*(type or print name of person certifying)*

*\* Only the date of filing (§ 1.6) will be the date used in a patent term adjustment calculation, although the date on any certificate of mailing or transmission under § 1.8 continues to be taken into account in determining timeliness. See § 1.703(f). Consider "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" (§ 1.10) or facsimile transmission (§ 1.6(d)) for the reply to be accorded the earliest possible filing date for patent term adjustment calculations.*

(check and complete applicable items below)

- ☐ An Examiner's Answer was mailed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ A Reply to the Examiner's Answer was submitted on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ ALLOWED APPLICATIONS  
the mailing of FORM POL-327 and/or Examiner's Amendment on \_\_\_\_\_

2. Kindly advise the undersigned of the present status of this application, by checking the appropriate box below. **A stamped return-addressed envelope is provided.**

NOTE: M.P.E.P. § 203.08 Status Inquiries, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, cautions as to the submission of status inquiries as follows:

**NEW APPLICATION**

*Current examining procedures now provide for the routine mailing from the Technology Centers (TCs) of Form PTOL-37 in every case of allowance of an application. Thus, the mailing of a form PTOL-37 in addition to a formal Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) in all allowed applications would seem to obviate the need for status inquiries even as a precautionary measure where the applicant may believe his or her new application may have been passed to issue on the first examination. However, as an exception, a status inquiry would be appropriate where a Notice of Allowance is not received within three months from receipt of form PTOL-37.*

*Current examining procedures also aim to minimize the spread in dates among the various examiner dockets of each art unit and TC with respect to actions on new applications. Accordingly, the dates of the "oldest new applications" appearing in the Official Gazette are fairly reliable guides as to the expected time frames of when the examiners reach the applications or action.*

*Therefore, it should be rarely necessary to query the status of a new application.*

**AMENDED APPLICATIONS**

*Amended applications are expected to be taken up by the examiner and an action completed within two months of the date the examiner receives the application. Accordingly, a status inquiry is not in order after reply by the attorney until 5 or 6 months have elapsed with no response from the Office. A postcard receipt for replies to the Office actions, adequately and specifically identifying the papers filed, will be considered prima facie proof of receipt of such papers. Where such proof indicates the timely filing of a reply, the submission of a copy of the postcard with a copy of the reply will ordinarily obviate the need for a petition to revive. Proof of receipt of a timely reply to a final action will obviate the need for a petition to revive only if the reply was in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.113.*

Reg. No.:

Tel. No.: ( )

Customer No.:



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

William R. Evans, 25858, (212) 708-1930  
(type or print name of practitioner)

P.O. Address

c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
26 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, N. Y. 10023



## STATUS INQUIRY REPLY

APPLICATION SERIAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ IS CURRENTLY

- ☐ ASSIGNED TO GROUP \_\_\_\_\_ AND AWAITS:
  - ☐ ACTION BY THE EXAMINER.
  - ☐ APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION MAILED  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ IS AWAITING ACTION BY THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
  - ☐ DATE OF HEARING EXPECTED \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ DECISION EXPECTED \_\_\_\_\_.